

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3, 4 and 6-93 are pending; claims 1, 3, 4 and 6-19 are allowed. Independent claims 20, 48, 72, 78, and 86 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly anticipated by Tran (EP 9 932 263 A2) or under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly obvious over Tran in view of Terao (US 7,039,097). Several claims depending from these independent claims have been indicated as allowable but for their dependence on a rejected base claim.

Each of the independent claims 20, 48, 72, 78, and 86 has been amended to clarify the distinctions between the claimed invention and the teachings of Tran. In particular, each claim has been amended to recite that a searcher grid for a RAKE receiver has a searcher grid resolution, and that one or more finger placement grids for the RAKE receiver each have a finger placement resolution that differs from the searcher grid resolution and is coarser than a base resolution for the RAKE receiver. These amendments are supported at least by the discussion in paragraphs [0015]-[0018] of the specification and by Figures 4, 14, and 15. Thus, no new matter has been added.

The present application is directed to various methods and apparatus that employ a “finger placement grid” for determining an appropriate delay setting for each of one or more processing fingers in a RAKE receiver. The spacing and resolution of this finger placement grid are independent of the resolution of measurement points used by a path searcher to establish a multipath delay profile, although the spacings for the finger placement grid and the searcher grid may both be based on multiples of a base resolution for the RAKE receiver. In some cases, the finger placement grid spacing may actually be larger than the searcher grid spacing, as shown in Figure 4. In several of the described embodiments, such an approach simplifies finger placement processing, since fewer than all possible finger placements need to be evaluated with respect to the multipath delay profile.

Tran, on the other hand, does not teach that a finger placement grid is defined and that one or more fingers are placed according to this defined finger placement grid. Rather, Tran describes a particular finger placement algorithm that places fingers according to the native delay resolution of a RAKE receiver, e.g., 1/8-chip. (See, e.g., Tran, ¶[0028].) Thus, Tran does not disclose or suggest a finger placement grid as described and claimed in the present application. In particular, Tran does not disclose or suggest a finger placement grid that has a resolution that is coarser than a base resolution for a RAKE receiver.

As amended, each of the independent claims 20, 48, 72, 78, and 86 are allowable over Tran, as Tran (at least) fails to disclose or suggest the use of a finger placement grid with a resolution that is coarser than a RAKE receiver's base resolution. Each of the rejected dependent claims is allowable for at least the same reason. In view of the present amendments, the claims previously objected to are now also allowable. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application and issuance of a notice of allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

COATS & BENNETT, P.L.L.C.



Daniel P. Homiller
Registration No.: 55,257

Dated: August 18, 2008

1400 Crescent Green, Suite 300
Cary, NC 27518
Telephone: (919) 854-1844
Facsimile: (919) 854-2084